DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 383 659 SP 035 999

AUTHOR Reeves-Kazelskis, Carolyn; King, Debra Ann
TITLE Teaching Concerns of Preservice Teachers.
PUB DATE 11 Nov 94
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (23rd, Nashville, TN, November 9-11, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Language Arts; Lecture Method; Methods Courses; Practicums; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Preservice Teachers

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify and compare the teaching concerns of two groups of preservice teachers who were taught language arts methodology through the use of different approaches. A traditional approach (lectures and demonstrations by the professor) was used with one group (n=43) and a field-experience approach (lectures by the professor, followed by practicum assignments in schools) was used with the other group (n=53). Teaching concerns were identified by having each preservice teacher list, and then rank order, his or her concerns about becoming a teacher; lists were obtained at the beginning of the semester and again at the end. Qualitative procedures were used to analyze and interpret the data. At the beginning of the semester, the most frequently occurring concern areas for each of the groups were similar: student discipline, being a good teacher, and having sufficient subject-matter knowledge. By the end of the semester, however, the two groups differed in their concern areas. A more realistic understanding of what it is to be a teacher in an elementary classroom was probably the key factor influencing the differences in concern areas between the two groups. A major difference was that concern about discipline increased in frequency among preservice teacher participating in field experiences and decreased among those who did not participate in field experiences. Also, it was found that concerns about being a good teacher and about problem parents decreased in frequency among preservice teachers who had field experiences. Data tables are attached. (Contains 17 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 383 659

Teaching Concerns of Preservice Teachers

Carolyn Reeves-Kazelskis Debra Ann King

University of Southern Mississippi

Hattiesburg, Mississippi

A Paper Presented at the Twenty-Third Annual Conference of the
Mid-South Educational Research Association
Nashville, Tennessee
November 9-11, 1994

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Reeves-Kazelskis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Running Head: Preservice Teaching Concerns

SP035999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teaching Concerns of Preservice Teachers

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to identify and compare the teaching concerns of two groups of preservice teachers who were taught language arts methodology through the use of different approaches. A traditional approach (i.e., lectures and demonstrations by the professor) was used with one group (n = 43), and a field-experience approach (i.e., lectures by the professor, followed by practicum assignments in schools) was used with the other group (n = 53). Teaching concerns were identified by having each preservice teacher list, and then rank order, his/her concerns about becoming a teacher; lists were obtained at the beginning of the semester and again at the end of the semester.

Qualitative procedures were used to analyze and interpret the data. At the beginning of the semester, the most frequently occurring concern areas for each of the groups were similar (e.g., concern about student discipline, being a good teacher, and having sufficient subject-matter knowledge). By the end of the semester, however, the two groups differed in their concern areas.

Teaching Concerns of Preservice Teachers

Introduction

Fuller (1969) and her colleagues associated with The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas were among the first teacher educators to conduct formal investigations of preservice teachers' concerns about teaching. The findings of Fuller and other researchers have indicated that teaching concerns of preservice teachers as well as inservice teachers should not be ignored and that teacher development, at both the preservice and inservice levels, may be improved by addressing concerns (Fuller, 1969; Fuller, 1971; Fuller & Case, 1971; George, 1974, 1978; Ingersoll, 1975; Kazelskis, Kersh, & Reeves, 1989; McNergney, 1977; Parsons & Fuller, 1972; Taylor, 1975; Yamamoto, 1969).

Fuller's initial inquiries into preservice teachers' concerns were conducted through the use of qualitative research procedures which included oral interviews with preservice teachers and the collection of written statements about their concerns obtained throughout their student teaching experience. The results of these inquries lead to the development of more formal measures, including the Teacher Concerns Statement (Fuller & Case, 1971), the Teachers Concerns Checklist, Form B (Fuller, Parsons, & Watkins, 1973; George, Borich, & Fuller, 1974; Parsons & Fuller, 1972), and the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (George, 1978). Of these measures, the Teachers Concerns Checklist, Form B (TCCL-B) and the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ), which is composed of 15 items representing self, task, and impact concerns derived from the 56-item TCCL-B, have continued to be utilized by researchers interested in the study of teaching concerns (Kazelskis & Reeves, 1987; Kazelskis, Reeves, & Kersh, 1991; Reeves & Kazelskis, 1985; Schipull, 1990).

The extent to which the greatest concerns of today's preservice teachers may be represented on the TCCL-B and the TCQ has not been investigated. Changes occurring during the past 20 years in the teacher's role, methods of delivering instruction, and the curriculum offered by public schools may be

creating concern areas which are not represented on the TCCL-B nor the TCQ. Also, teacher education programs of the 1990s are structured differently than those of the 1970s, a factor which may influence the nature of concerns found among today's preservice teachers.

The present study was designed to explore the teaching concerns of today's preservice teachers without restricting their responses to a pre-determined list of teaching concerns. Two questions were addressed by the study:

(1) What are the teaching concerns of preservice teachers?

(2) Does the type of approach used to teach language arts methodology influence preservice teachers' concerns?

Methodology

Sample

The sample included 96 preservice teachers attending a southeastern university. The preservice teachers were preparing for certification in elementary education and were in their junior year of coursework. Forty-three of the preservice teachers were enrolled in two sections of the language arts methodology course, taught by two professors who used a traditional approach for the delivery of content. The mean age of the preservice teachers enrolled in the traditional sections was 26.01 years, and the mean grade-point-average for this group was 3.18. The remaining 53 preservice teachers were enrolled in two other sections of the language arts methodology course, taught by two professors who used a field-experience approach for the delivery of content. The mean age of the preservice teachers taught by the field-experience approach was 25.55, and the mean grade-point-average for this group was 3.17. There were 41 white females, 1 black female, and 1 black male enrolled in the two traditional classes, and there were 50 white females, 2 black females, and 1 Asian female enrolled in the two field-experience classes.

Delivery of Language Arts Methodology

Traditional Approach. Professors associated with the traditional

approach provided instruction in language arts content/methodology through use of lectures, demonstrations, and cooperative learning activities. The format of each lecture session focused on increasing preservice teachers' comprehension of language content/methodology by including prereading/prelecture, during reading/during lecture, and postreading/postlecture activities. Brainstorming, graphic organizers, concept mapping/webbing, and the development of lesson plans that could be used in elementary classrooms were among the strategies used to enhance preservice teachers' comprehension of the course content. Demonstrations consisted of presentations by the professors as well as individual demonstrations by the preservice teachers who were attempting to model how specific instructional strategies (e.g., developing students' oral language skills through wordless books, the directed-reading-thinking-approach (DRTA), process writing activities to develop composition skills of students) could be used in elementary classrooms.

Field-Experience Approach. Professors associated with the field-experience approach provided instruction in language arts content/methodology through use of lectures, cooperative learning activities, and language arts practicum assignments in school settings. The first eight weeks of the semester included lectures and cooperative learning activities in which preservice teachers worked in small groups to plan lessons and instructional activities that they would be teaching to elementary students during the field-experience component of the course. For example, the preservice teachers planned lessons to develop elementary students' oral language skills, to utilize the directed-reading-thinking-approach (DRTA) to enhance elementary students' comprehension of subject-matter, and to develop composition skills of elementary students through the use of process writing activities. For the next four weeks of the semester, preservice teachers conducted practicum assignments in elementary classrooms (one preservice teacher per classroom in grades K-5) twice a week in lieu of meeting class on campus; they were

required to keep a journal during the four-week period. The professors of the course supervised the practicum assignments, holding class meetings on campus once each week during the field-experience component to reflect upon the practicum assignments and the things that preservices teachers were learning as a result of the field experiences. After the field-experience component had ended, the remainder of the course included lectures by the professors and small-group activities.

Instrumentation

Teaching concerns were obtained by using a free-response procedure, similar to the procedure used by Fuller (1969) during her initial inquiries into preservice teachers' concerns. The same set of procedures was used to collect both pre- and post-course concerns. Each preservice teacher was given a sheet of paper on which to list her/his teaching concerns, after reading the definition of concern which was derived from the definition given by Fuller and George (1978) on the Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (TCQ). The sheet of paper contained the following information:

> At this point in time, what things concern you the most about being a teacher? (A concern is defined as something you find yourself thinking about a lot; you want to do something about it so that you can reduce your anxiety about it.) In the space below, use single words or phrases to list your concerns. Do not list more than 10 concerns. After listing the concerns, put a 1 beside the one that concerns you the most, a 2 beside the one that you have the second-most concern about, and a 3 beside the one that you have the third-most concern about, etc. This information will help us improve our teacher training program.
>
> When I think about being a teacher, I am concerned about . . .
>
> (blank space provided here for list of concerns)

Qualitative procedures were used to analyze and interpret the free-response lists of teaching concerns.

Procedures

Preservice teachers enrolled in four classes (sections) of a language arts methods course required for elementary education majors were included in the study. The classes were taught by four professors, two of whom taught classes using a traditional approach and two of whom taught classes using a field-experience approach. The language arts content was the same for the four classes, but field-experiences were required in two of the classes.

The pre-course data were collected during the first week of the semester. Each of the four professors told their language arts classes that the teacher education department was trying to improve its program and wanted to know the kinds of things that concern preservice teachers so that, perhaps, the program could be altered in ways that would reduce or eliminate some of the concerns of preservice teachers before they graduated. The professors asked the preservice teachers to think about the concerns they had at the present time about becoming a teacher. There was no discussion among the preservice teachers about their concerns. Next, sheets for listing their concerns were distributed and the preservice teachers were instructed to read the explanatory information at the top of the sheet and respond to the stem, "When I think about my becoming a teacher, I am concerned about ...," by listing and then rank ordering the concerns that each of them felt at the present time. There was no time limit imposed during this free-response procedure, but it took approximately 8-12 minutes for the preservice teachers to complete their responses. Before turning in their responses, preservice teachers were instructed to write their social security numbers on their sheets; it was explained that they would be given an opportunity at the end of the semester to list the concerns they had at the end of the course and that the social security numbers would be used to match their responses so that the teacher education faculty could gain an understanding of the how methods courses in education might be influencing their teaching concerns. The professors assured the preservice students that their concerns would have no

bearing on the grades they received in the course.

For the first eight weeks of the semester, the professors of all four classes provided lectures and cooperative learning experiences for the preservice teachers. During weeks 9-12 of the semester, preservice teachers in the field-experience classes spent eight class sessions (i.e., two per week for four weeks) in local classrooms conducting practicum assignments, in specific language arts areas, with small and large groups of elementary students. After the four-week field-experience was completed, the professors of the field-experience classes spent the remaining weeks of the semester providing lectures and cooperative learning experiences for the preservice teachers. Throughout the semester, preservice teachers in the traditional classes continued to receive lectures and demonstrations by the professors, and they individually modeled for their classmates specific instructional strategies that could be used to teach language arts skills to elementary students.

During the week before final exams, the post-course data were collected. Each of the professors reminded the preservice teachers that they had listed their teaching concerns at the beginning of the semester, explaining that the teacher education department was attempting to find ways to improve teacher education. The professors told them that it might be that their teaching concerns had not changed during the semester, that they might have more concerns, that they might have fewer concerns, or that they might feel more strongly now about a particular concern than they had at the beginning of the semester. The professors asked the preservice teachers to think about the concerns they <u>now had</u> about becoming a teacher, but there was no group discussion about their co erns. Next, sheets for listing their concerns were distributed and the preservice teachers were instructed to read the explanatory information at the top of the sheet and respond to the stem, "When I think about my becoming a teacher, I am concerned about ...," by listing and then rank ordering the concerns that each of them felt <u>at the present time</u>.

There was no time limit imposed during this free-response procedure, but it took approximately 8-12 minutes for the preservice teachers to complete their responses.

Results

Data analyses included the pre- and post-course responses of 96 preservice teachers. To analyze the data, the free-response lists of teaching concerns were used to create a set of descriptive phrases which incorporated the concerns of the respondents. For example, the following descriptive phrases were derived from items (concerns) such as those shown below each phrase:

having subject-matter knowledge

- I am afraid that I do not know all that I am going to need to know.
- I am concerned that I will not be prepared to teach subjects in the upper grades.

parent involvement

- I am worried about parents who are not involved in their child's education.
- I do not know how to make parents become interested in their child's education.

As descriptive phrases were needed to reflect the essence of concerns not previously identified, the phrases were created and added to a large matrix on which frequency counts of teaching concerns were recorded. Using this procedure, descriptive phrases of concern areas were created for pre- and post-course responses. Frequency counts of teaching concerns were coded in two ways: a) by disregarding the ranked order of concerns, referred to as "nonranked concerns," and b) by ranked order of concerns, referred to as "ranked concerns."

Findings for Total Group

Frequently occurring concerns were designated as those listed 20 or more

times by the total group, indicating that approximately 20% of the preservice teachers had expressed the concerns. Conversely, less frequently occurring concerns were designated as those listed less than 20 times.

Non-ranked Concerns. At the beginning of the semester, a total of 56 concern areas were identified for the total group of preservice teachers, with the frequency of occurrence ranging from 1 (concern about AIDS/Health Problems) to 52 (concern about discipline). Of the 56 concern areas, only 42 remained concern areas at the end of the semester, with the frequency of occurrence ranging from 1 (for 11 of the concern areas) to 38 (concern about discipline). As shown in Table 1, the frequency distribution of non-ranked concerns indicated that each of the frequently occurring pre-course concern areas (i.e., being a good teacher, discipline, having subject matter knowledge) decreased in frequency by the end of the semester for the total group of preservice teachers.

Four concern areas, which were among the less frequently occurring pre-course non-ranked concerns, increased slightly in frequency by the end of the semester: administrative support, classroom management, fairness to all students, and keeping students on task.

Ranked Concerns. Each of the frequently occurring ranked concerns decreased in frequency by the end of the semester; however, students continued to list discipline as a frequent concern.

Seven concern areas, which were among the less frequently occurring pre-course ranked concerns, increased slightly in frequency by the end of the semester: administrative support, classroom management, fairness to all students, lesson plan effectiveness, paperwork load, professional appearance, and special needs students.

Findings by Group

Frequently occurring concerns were designated as those listed 10 or more times for either of the groups, indicating that approximately 25% of the preservice teachers taught by the traditional approach or 20% of those taught

by the field-experience approach had expressed the concerns. Conversely, less frequently occurring concerns were designated as those listed less than 10 times by either of the groups.

Non-ranked Concerns. The frequently occurring pre-course concerns of preservice teachers taught by the traditional approach were: being a good teacher, discipline, having subject matter knowledge, lesson plan effectiveness, and obtaining employment, with concern about discipline being the most frequent concern. As shown in Table 2, these five concern areas decreased in frequency by the end of the semester; one concern area, however, increased slightly in frequency by the end of the semester: administrative support.

Frequently occurring pre-course concerns of preservice teachers taught by the field-experience approach were: being a good teacher, discipline, effective delivery of instruction, keeping students' interest, parent involvement, and student achievement, with concern about discipline being the most frequent concern. All of these concern areas decreased in frequency by the end of the semester; ten concern areas, however, increased slightly in frequency by the end of the semester: church/school issues, classroom management, fairness to all students, having subject matter knowledge, keeping students on task, keeping up with trends, lesson planning effectiveness, obtaining employment, special needs students, and state versus individual philosophy.

Ranked Concerns. Frequently occurring pre-course concerns of preservice teachers taught by the traditional approach were: discipline, having subject matter knowledge, and obtaining employment. As shown in Table 2, concern in these three areas decreased by the end of the semester; four concern areas, however, increased slightly in frequency by the end of the semester: administrative support, being evaluated by others, professional appearance, and student achievement.

Frequently occurring pre-course concerns of preservice teachers taught

by the field-experience approach were: being a good teacher, discipline, and problem parents. Concern about discipline increased in frequency while concerns about being a good teacher and problem parents decreased by the end of the semester. In addition to concern about discipline, eight concern areas increased slightly in frequency by the end of the semester: amount of state curriculum, classroom management, fairness to all students, having subject matter knowledge, keeping up with trends, lesson planning effectiveness, obtaining employment, and special needs students.

Discussion

Based on the findings, it appears that the instructional approach used in educational methodology courses does influence the teaching concerns of preservice teachers. By the end of the semester, the group of preservice teachers who had participated in field experiences differed in their concerns from the group who had not participated in field experiences. The major difference between the concerns of the two groups was that concern about discipline increased in frequency among preservice teachers participating in field experiences and decreased in frequency among preservice teachers who did not participate in field experiences. Also, it was found that concerns about being a good teacher and problem parents decreased in frequency among preservice teachers who had field experiences while eight of the less frequently occurring pre-course ranked concern areas increased slightly in frequency. In comparison, frequently occurring pre-course concerns of preservice teachers who did not participate in field experiences decreased in frequency by the end of the semester with slight increases in frequency noted for three of the less frequently occurring pre-course ranked concern areas. It appears that a more realistic understanding of what it is to be a teacher in an actual elementary classroom was probably the key factor influencing the differences in concern areas between the two groups by the end of the semester. This interpretation is supported in two ways: (1) by the increase in frequency of ranked concerns listed by preservice teachers participating in

field expriences about discipline and other concern areas directly linked to classroom settings (e.g., classroom management, fairness to all students, having subject matter knowledge, lesson planning effectiveness, special needs students), and (2) by the increase in frequency of ranked concerns listed by preservice teachers not participating in field experiences about areas which can only be resolved through experiences in a school setting (e.g., administrative support, being evaluated by others, student achievement). By the end of the semester, increases in the ranked concerns of preservice teachers who participated in field experiences reflected a reality-based view of what teaching is all about, while increases in the ranked concerns of the preservice teachers who did not participate in field experiences lacked this perspective. These findings offer support for the inclusion of more school-based experiences prior to the student-teaching semester.

It is important to note that both of the instructional approaches appeared to be effective in decreasing frequently occurring pre-course concerns (with the exception of concern about discipline found among the field-experience group). By the end of the semester, however, a comparison of the nature of the ranked concerns which increased in frequency for each of the two groups of preservice teachers indicates that the preservice teachers who participated in field experiences had a more realistic view of the actual classroom setting.

It was interesting to find that 18 of the concerns listed by preservice teachers in the present study were also included on the TCCL-B (developed by Fuller and her colleagues), including concerns about areas such as: being a good teacher, discipline, having subject matter knowledge, and classroom management. In the present study, however, 26 concern areas were identified which were not included on the TCCL-B, with ten of the concern areas representing contemporary problems, such as school violence and lawsuits. Also, there were 11 concern areas included on the TCCL-B which were not found in the present study, such as being accepted as a friend by students and

assessing and reporting student progress. Further, all 15 of the concerns which compose the TCQ (Fuller and George, 1978) were found to be among the concerns of preservice teachers in the present study. Even though the TCQ contains the same concerns expressed by the preservice teachers in the present study, it may be limited in its scope because it does not include concerns about contemporary school-related problems.

Since the present study was exploratory in nature, the findings cannot be generalized to other populations. The evidence presented in this study indicates that inclusion of field experiences in methodology courses does influence the concerns of preservice teachers by creating a more realistic perception of the classroom setting. More research is needed to understand how field experiences may contribute to the resolution of preservice teaching concerns, may create additional teaching concerns, or may exacerbate existing concerns of preservice teachers. It is not known whether or not the point of placement of field experiences in methodology courses (at the beginning, middle, or end of the course) may result in different kinds of teaching concerns. It may be that field experiences at the beginning of methodology courses cause preservice teachers to give more serious attention to remaining coursework, or it may be that early field experiences merely raise levels of anxiety about concerns and do little to resolve them. Also, the length (i.e., two weeks, three weeks, etc.) of the field experience may be an important variable in the resolution, intensity, or emergence of some teaching concerns. It is recommended that longitudinal studies be designed to explore how teaching concerns are affected by variables such as the point of placement of field experiences in methodology courses, the length of the field experience, and the requirements (e.g., teaching lessons to small groups of students, working with slow learners, scoring papers, etc.) of the field experience. Such studies should include regularly-scheduled interviews with preservice teachers throughout their field experiences so that factors which increase, as well as those that decrease, teaching concerns may be identified.

References

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 207-226.

Fuller, F. F. (1971). Relevance for teacher education: A teacher concerns model. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Fuller, F. F., & Case, C. (1971). A manual for scoring the teacher concerns statment. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Fuller, F. F., Parsons, J. S., & Watkins, J. (1973). Concerns of teachers: Research and reconceptualization. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

George, A. A. (1974). Analysis of five hypothesized factors on the teacher concerns checklist, Form B. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

George, A. A., Borich, G. D., & Fuller, F. F. (1974). Progress report on the teacher concerns checklist. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

George, A. A. (1978). Measuring self, task, and impact concerns: A manual for use of the teacher concerns questionnaire. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Ingersoll, G. M. (April, 1975). Assessing inservice training needs through teacher responses. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Kazelskis, R., Kersh, M. E., & Reeves, C. K. (1989). Undergraduate teacher education preparation and level of concern about teaching. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Little Rock.

Kazelskis, R., & Reeves, C. K. (1987). Concern dimensions of preservice teachers. Educational Research Quarterly, 11(4), 45-52.

Kazelskis, R., Reeves, C. K., & Kersh, M. E. (1991). Effects of student teaching on teaching concerns and efficacy. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Lexington.

McNergney, R. F. (April, 1977). Assessing perceived needs for training preservice teachers, inservice teachers and other educational personnel in cooperative teaching centers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Parsons, J. S., & Fuller, F. F. (1972). Concerns of teachers: Reliability, bipolarity, and relationship to teaching experience. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas.

Reeves, C. K., & Kazelskis, R. (1985). Concerns of preservice and inservice teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 78, 267-271.

Schipull, D. W. (1990). A study of the validity and reliability of the teacher concerns checklist. Dissertation Abstracts International.

Taylor, P. H. (1975). A study of the concerns of students on a postgraduate certificate in education courses. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1(2), 151-161.

Yamamoto, K., Pederson, D.J., Opdahl, R., Dangel, H., Townsend, C.E., Paleologos, M.B., & Smith, N. (1969). As they see it: Culling impressions from teachers in preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 20, 465-475.

Table 1

Frequency of Occurrence of Concern Areas for the Total Group

Concern Areas	Non-ranked Concerns		Ranked Concerns*	
	Pre-Course	Post-Course	Pre-Course	Post-Course
AIDS/health problems	1	0	1	0
administrative support	4	7[b]	3	6[b]
amount of state curriculum	10	7	7	7
being a good teacher	26[a]	14	19	13
being evaluated by others	7	5	6	5
being good role model	2	1	0	1
being patient enough	3	0	2	0
being respected by society	1	0	0	0
church/school issues	1	2	0	1
classroom management	10	13[b]	8	13[b]
creative teaching	13	7	8	6
creating positive environment	4	1	2	1
dealing with learning problems	2	0	2	0
discipline	52[a]	38[a]	41[a]	38[a]
displaying professional demeanor	3	0	0	0
drugs/alcohol	2	3	0	1
dysfunctional families	9	5	6	6
effective delivery of instruction	19	7	13	7
fairness to all students	3	7[b]	2	6[b]
future of education	3	0	2	0
having proper school supplies	11	8	6	7
having subject matter knowledge	21[a]	16	16	15
keeping students' interest	17	8	10	8
keeping students on task	1	3[b]	3	3
keeping up with trends	9	7	6	7
lack of community support	0	1	0	1
lack environmental issues studied	1	0	0	0
lack of sex education	1	1	0	1
lawsuits	1	0	0	0
lesson planning effectiveness	16	12	8	11[b]
liking teaching as profession	3	1	1	1
making teaching mistakes	9	4	5	4
motivating students	12	1	6	1
obtaining employment	17	4	11	9
paperwork load	2	2	0	2[b]
parent involvement	19	7	10	7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1 (Continued)

Frequency of Occurrence of Concern Areas for the Total Group

Concern Areas	Non-ranked Concerns		Ranked Concerns*	
	Pre-Course	Post-Course	Pre-Course	Post-Course
periodic recertification	2	0	0	0
planning for individual needs	17	9	14	9
problem parents	13	2	11	1
professional appearance	2	0	1	4[b]
reporting child abuse	3	1	1	1
school assigned to	5	0	1	0
school politics	5	2	2	3
school violence	4	2	3	1
socioeconomic problems	3	0	0	0
special needs students	7	4	2	4[b]
state vs. individual philosophy	3	2	2	1
student achievement	12	9	8	9
student lack of desire to read	2	0	3	1
student respect	5	5	4	4
teacher pay	7	1	4	1
teacher stress/burnout	6	1	0	1
teacher/student ratio	2	1	4	1
teaching reading skills	6	2	6	3
teaching morals	3	1	2	2
time for personal life/family	1	0	0	0

*Frequency amounts are totals for rankings, disregarding the position of the rankings

[a]Frequently occurring concern

[b]Concern increased slightly in frequency by end of course

Table 2

Frequency of Occurrence of Concern Areas, by Group*

Concern Areas	Non-ranked Concerns				Ranked Concerns*			
	Pre-Course		Post-Course		Pre-Course		Post-Course	
	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F
AIDS/health problems	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
administrative support	0	4	3[b]	4	1	2	3[b]	3
amount of state curriculum	7	3	3	4	5	2	3	4[c]
being a good teacher	11[a]	15[a]	8	6	6	13[a]	7	6
being evaluated by others	4	3	5	0	3	3	5[b]	0
being good role model	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0
being patient enough	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
being respected by society	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
church/school issues	1	0	0	2[c]	0	0	0	1
classroom management	9	1	6	7[c]	7	1	6	7[c]
creative teaching	8	5	2	5	5	3	2	4
creating positive environment	1	3	0	1	0	2	0	1
dealing with learning problems	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0
discipline	21[a]	31[a]	8	30[a]	13[a]	28[a]	8	30[a,c]
displaying professional demeanor	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
drugs/alcohol	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0
dysfunctional families	2	7	1	4	1	5	1	5
effective delivery of instruction	9	10[a]	3	4	6	7	3	4
fairness to all students	0	3	0	7[c]	0	2	0	6[c]
future of education	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
having proper school supplies	5	6	3	5	3	3	3	4
having subject matter knowledge	15[a]	6	7	9[c]	10[a]	6	6	9[c]
keeping students' interest	7	10[a]	1	7	3	7	1	7
keeping students on task	0	1	0	3[c]	0	3	0	3
keeping up with trends	7	2	0	7[c]	2	4	0	7[c]
lack of community support	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
lack environmental issues studied	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
lack of sex education	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
lawsuits	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
lesson planning effectiveness	10[a]	6	3	9[c]	5	3	3	8[c]
liking teaching as profession	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
making teaching mistakes	5	4	0	4	2	3	0	4
motivating students	8	4	0	1	2	4	0	1
obtaining employment	15[a]	2	0	4[c]	10[a]	1	6	3[c]
paperwork load	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2 (Continued)

Frequency of Occurrence of Concern Areas, by Group*

Concern Areas	Non-ranked Concerns				Ranked Concerns**			
	Pre-Course		Post-Course		Pre-Course		Post-Course	
	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F
parent involvement	4	15[a]	2	5	2	8	2	5
periodic recertification	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
planning for individual needs	9	8	3	6	7	7	3	6
problem parents	5	8	0	2	1	10[a]	0	1
professional appearance	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	1
reporting child abuse	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
school assigned to	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
school politics	3	2	0	2	0	2	1	2
school violence	4	0	2	0	3	0	1	0
socioeconomic problems	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
special needs students	6	1	1	3[c]	2	0	1	3[c]
state vs. individual philosophy	3	0	0	2[c]	1	1	0	1
student achievement	2	10[a]	3	6	1	7	3[b]	6
student lack of desire to read	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	1
student respect	0	5	1	4	0	4	1	3
teacher pay	3	4	1	0	1	3	1	0
teacher stress/burnout	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
teacher/student ratio	1	2	0	1	1	3	0	1
teaching reading skills	2	4	0	2	2	4	0	3
teaching morals	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	2
time for personal life/family	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Group: T = Traditional Approach used with group
F = Field Experience Approach used with group

**Frequency amounts are totals for rankings, disregarding the position of the rankings

[a]Frequently occurring concern

[b]Concern increased slightly in frequency by end of the course for the traditional approach

[c]Concern increased slightly in frequency by end of the course for the field-experience approach